



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/760,296	01/16/2001	Tony Hashem	52493.000112	1873

7590

04/28/2005

Jennifer A. Albert, Esq.  
Hunton & Williams  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

NAJJAR, SALEH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2157

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/760,296

Applicant(s)

HASHEM ET AL.

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/3/2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2157

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on February 3, 2005. Claims 6, 17, 28, and 36 were amended. Claims 1-40 are pending examination. Claims 1-40 represent method and system for routing information in a data processing system.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ouchi, U.S. Patent No. 6,370,567 (submitted by the applicant as prior art).

Ouchi teaches the invention as claimed including an e-mail based workflow system and method (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Ouchi teaches a method for routing information in a data processing system comprising the steps of :

checking an inbox periodically to determine if new data has been received in the inbox (see figs. 1-3; col. 5, lines 1-55, Ouchi discloses that form route manager periodically checks inbox for new data);

determining a destination for the new data based on a routing table associated with the inbox if new data has been received in the inbox; and transmitting the new data to the determined destination (see col. 5, line 60- col. 6, line 35; col. 7-8, Ouchi discloses that the form router determines a destination for the data based on a routing table).

As to claim 2, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 1 wherein the step of checking the inbox periodically includes a sub-step of checking a plurality of inboxes periodically (see fig. 22; col. 7-8; col. 16).

As to claim 3, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 2 wherein each of the plurality of inboxes has a routing table associated with it (see fig. 22; co. 7-8; col. 16, Ouchi discloses that a routing table is associated with the inbox).

Art Unit: 2157

As to claim 4, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 1 wherein the step of determining the destination includes a sub-step of matching information in an index field of the new data with information in the routing table and reading destination information associated with the matching information in the routing table (see col. 6, lines 30-35, Ouchi discloses that the control field within the data is used to look up a route in the routing table).

As to claim 5, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 4 wherein the index field comprises one of each of a policy holder name, a social security number, a date of birth, a doctor name, a provider name, a type of document and a destination (see col. 6, lines 1-40).

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouchi, U.S. Patent No. 6,370,567.

Ouchi teaches the invention substantially as claimed including an e-mail based workflow system and method (see abstract).

As to claim 6, Ouchi teaches the method of routing information in a data processing system comprising the steps of:

receiving a data package (document/email file) including a control field in a first inbox of an information router from a first external system (see figs. 1-3; col. 5, lines 1-55; col. 8, Ouchi discloses that form route manager receives document data in the inbox, the document including a control field);

checking the first inbox periodically to determine if new data has been received in the inbox (see fig. 5, Ouchi clearly illustrates periodically checking the inbox for new messages);

recording the receipt of the data package in an event transaction logging database (see col. 8, lines 50-55, Ouchi discloses that a database containing history events for the document is maintained);

transmitting the data package to a package examination engine; reading the control field in the package examination engine; comparing information in the control field to a routing table (see col. 8-9, Ouchi discloses that a control field is used as an index into a routing table for the document);

following an error procedure included in the routing table if the information in the control field does not match an entry in the routing table or if there is a package error; and transmitting the data package to a destination system based on corresponding routing information included in the routing table if the information in the descriptor file matches an entry in the routing table (see fig. 21; col. 15-16).

Ouchi fails to teach the claimed limitation of a descriptor file. Ouchi does teach that a control field is used for indexing into the routing table for finding a path to be used to route the document (see col. 8-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ouchi by specifying a descriptor file in place of the control field since the same functionality of indexing the routing table is achieved.

As to claim 7, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 6 wherein the step of transmitting the data package includes a sub-step of placing the package in a predetermined receptacle to await transmission to the destination system (see col. 4, lines 1-40, Ouchi discloses that an inbox is used to store the document to await transmission to the destination).

As to claim 8, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 7, wherein the predetermined receptacle is one of an outbox of the information router and an inbox of the destination system (see col. 4, lines 1-50).

As to claim 9, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 6 wherein the step of following the error procedure includes a sub-step of placing the data package into a predefined inbox of an email address (see col. 15, lines 40-66; col. 16, lines 1-10).

Ouchi does not teach the limitation of an internal error document storage directory. Ouchi does teach that in case of an error in delivering the document, one of several predefined destinations could be used to route the e-mail (see col. 15, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ouchi by specifying the predefined e-mail destination as internal error document storage directory since the same functionality of allowing the destination to handle the error is achieved.

As to claim 10, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 6 wherein the step following the error procedure includes a sub-step of transmitting the data package to one of several predefined destinations (see col. 15, lines 55-65).

Ouchi does not teach the limitation of a second external system for specialized handling. Ouchi does teach that in case of an error in delivering the document, one of several predefined destinations could be used to route the e-mail (see col. 15, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ouchi by specifying the predefined e-mail destination as external system for specialized handling since the same functionality of allowing the destination to handle the error is achieved.

As to claim 11, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 6 further comprising a step of recording an entry into the event transaction logging database for each processing operation performed on the data package (see col. 8-9).

As to claim 12, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 6 further comprising a step of pulling the data package into the first inbox of the information router from an outbox of the first external system (see col. 7-8).

As to claim 13, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 6 further comprising a step of receiving the data package back from the destination system in a second inbox of the information router after the destination system has processed the data package (see fig. 22; col. 16).

As to claim 14, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 13 wherein the first inbox of the information router and the second inbox of the information router are the same (see figs. 1-5; col. 5-8).

As to claim 15, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 6 further comprising a step of creating the routing table to correspond to a predetermined data package format, the routing table having a plurality of fields (see col. 8).

As to claim 16, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 15 wherein the routing table fields include at least one of a source system field, a source directory field, a criteria field, a destination system field, a destination directory field, an error system field and an error location field (see col. 6; col. 8).

As to claim 17, Ouchi teaches the method of monitoring one or more data packages routed through an information router comprising the steps of:

recording each transaction performed by the information router on each of the one or more data packages (see figs. 1-5; col. 8, lines 1-60; col. 9, lines 1-40, Ouchi discloses that the document data is tracked in a move history table).

monitoring a location of each of the one or more data packages; and transmitting information regarding the data package to a user (see col. 8-9, Ouchi discloses that a document can be monitored and tracked which information is reported to a client).

Ouchi fails to teach the claimed limitation of a descriptor file. Ouchi does teach that a control field is used for indexing into the routing table for finding a path to be used to route the document (see col. 8-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ouchi by specifying a descriptor file in place of the control field since the same functionality of indexing the routing table is achieved.

As to claim 18, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 17 wherein the step of recording each transaction includes a sub-step of recording at least one of a package arrival event, a package routing event, a package changing event and a package forwarding event (see col. 8, lines 1-50, Ouchi discloses that the document is tracked using a move history table).

As to claim 19, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 17 further comprising assigning a unique transaction identification to each of the one or more data packages for recording information regarding each of the one or more data packages for a time when each of the one or more data packages enters the information router until another time when each of the one or more data packages leaves the information router (see col. 8-9).

As to claim 20, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 17 wherein the step of recording each transaction includes a sub-step of recording each transaction in a database (see col. 8).

As to claim 21, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 17 wherein the step of recording each transaction builds a complete tracking history of each of the one or more data packages for a time when each of the one or more data packages enters the information router until another time when each of the one or more data packages leaves the information router (see col. 8, lines 1-50, Ouchi discloses that the document is tracked using a move history table).

As to claim 22, Ouchi teaches process of claim 17 wherein the step of transmitting information regarding each of the one or more data packages to a user includes a sub-step of transmitting information concerning at least one of a number of the stops made by each of the one or more data packages, a time at which the at least one of the number of the steps was made by each of the one or more data packages, and a system to which the at least one of the one or more data packages was routed (see col. 8-9).

As to claim 23, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 17 further comprising a step of scanning for any of the one or more data packages that have not been forwarded and determining at least one of an exact location of each of the one or more non-forwarded data packages and a forwarding location of each of the one or more data packages (see col. 15-16).



As to claim 24, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 23 further comprising a step of using a query tool to scan for each of the one or more non-forwarded data packages (see col. 8-9).

As to claim 25, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 17 further comprising the steps of:

generating a report including at least one of a plurality of system statistics and a plurality of data packages in inboxes to users; and transmitting the report over a network (see col. 15-16).

Ouchi fails to teach the limitation of an error queue. Ouchi does teach that one of a plurality of destination e-mail addresses could be designated to receive an error report concerning a document (see col. 15, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ouchi by specifying the destination e-mail inbox as an error queue since the same functionality of queuing errors generated by the system is achieved.

As to claim 26, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 17 further comprising a step of:

downloading, the information regarding each of the one or more data packages at a plurality of predetermined time intervals from the information router to an external database wherein the information regarding each of the one or more data packages from the information router may be combined with information regarding each of the one or more data packages from one or more external systems (see col. 8-9).

As to claim 27, Ouchi teaches the process of claim 17 wherein the step of transmitting information regarding each of the one or more data packages includes a sub-step of transmitting information regarding each of the one or more data packages in response to a user request (see col. 8-10).

Claims 28-40 do not teach or define any new limitation beyond the above rejected claims 6-27 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

6. Applicant's arguments filed February 3, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that there Ouchi reference does not teach periodically checking the inbox.

In response, Ouchi clearly provides a block diagram illustrating a functional block which performs a loop checking the inbox for new messages (see fig. 5; col. 5). This reads on the broad claim language of "periodically checking the inbox".

**7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**8.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (571)272-4006. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Saleh Najjar  
Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157